

MERRITT HEARD FROM  
His Laconic Report of the  
Capture of Manila.

A PROCLAMATION TO NATIVES

He Guarantees Protection of Life, Property, Trade, and Religion.

AUGUSTIN DID NOT "ABDICATE."

He Only Declined Responsibility

When Spain Failed to Send Help—

Terror Before the Bombardment—

Authorities Urged to Surrender.

WASHINGTON, August 18.—The War Department has received the following:

Manila, August 18.—Adjutant-General Dwyer joined me in a forty-eight hour notification to the Spanish Commander to remove non-combatants from the city. On the same date a reply was received expressing thanks for our humane sentiments, and stating that the Spanish were without places of refuge for non-combatants then within the walled town, on the 8th instant we sent a joint note, calling attention to the suffering in store for women and non-combatants in case it became our duty to reduce the defenses, and also setting forth the hopeless condition of Spain's forces, surrounded on all sides, with the fleet in front, and no prospects of reinforcements, and demanded surrender as due to every consideration of humanity. On the same date we received a reply, admitting their situation, but stating that the council of defense declared that our request for surrender could not be granted, but offered to consult the government if time was granted necessary for communication via Hongkong. We sent a joint note in reply, declining. On the 13th I joined with the navy in the attack, with the following result: After about half an hour's accurate shelling of the Spanish lines, MacArthur's brigade on the right and Green's on the left, under Anderson, made a vigorous attack and carried the Spanish works. Loss not accurately known; about fifty in all. The behavior of our troops was excellent and the co-operation of the navy most valuable. The troops advanced rapidly on the walled city, upon which white flags were shown, and the town capitulated. Troops occupy Manila, Bionondo, the walled city, and San Miguel. All important centers protected. Insurgents kept out. No disorder or pillage.

MERRITT.

AMERICANS HOLD EVERY POSITION

Trade Revival in Manila—Cable to be Repaired.

HONGKONG, August 18.—A dispatch from the correspondent at Manila of the Associated Press, confirming the capture of the town, says the American troops now occupy every position formerly held by the Spaniards, of whom 6,000 are prisoners. Not a single shot was fired at the fleet. The dispatch also says that Admiral Dewey picked up the end of the severed cable on Friday, but that the line is not yet in working order.

Metchum, an American leaving Hongkong daily from Manila. A great rush of trade is expected.

THE GOVERNMENT OF MANILA.

General Merritt Issues a Proclamation, Which is Most Reasonable.

NEW YORK, August 18.—A special dispatch to the World from Manila, August 18th, says: General Merritt has prepared a proclamation to the natives, which provides a scheme of government for Manila and surrounding territory and other chief points in our possession, the chief points of which are:

"Rigid protection to all in personal liberty; municipal laws, tribunals, and local institutions for punishment of crime to remain until notice, except where incompatible with military rule, subject to the supervision of the American General; provost marshal and sub-provosts to be appointed with power to arrest civil as well as military offenders; open trade for neutral nations; public property to be rigorously protected; no interference with the people so long as they preserve peace. General Merritt occupies the Governor's Palace.

NO JOINT OCCUPATION FOR US.

War Department Cables Merritt to Ignore the Philippine Insurgents.

WASHINGTON, August 18.—The War Department to-day made public the order sent to General Merritt last evening regarding the occupation of the city of Manila by the American forces. The order follows:

"Adjutant-General's Office, Washington, August 17, 1898.—Major-General Merritt, Manila, Philippines: The President directs that there must be no joint occupation with the insurgents. The United States, in the possession of Manila city, Manila bay and harbor, must preserve the peace and protect persons and property within the territory occupied by their military and naval forces. The insurgents and all others must recognize the military occupation and authority of the United States and the cessation of hostilities proclaimed by the President. Use whatever means in your judgment are necessary to this end. All law-abiding people must be treated alike.

THEY KISSED AND EMBRACED.

Affecting Meeting of Fitz Lee and Old Joe Wheeler.

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 18.—An affecting scene characterized the meeting to-day in the office of Secretary of War, Major-General Wheeler, and Lee. They are old friends and comrades-in-arms, but had not met since the war began. Each grasped the other by both hands, and then General Lee drew his friend to his heart, and they hugged and kissed each other, regardless of the fact that many other persons were present. Secretary Alger was visibly affected.

CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATS.

James C. Maguire Nominated for Governor—Proposed Fusion.

SAN DIEGO, CAL., August 18.—The Democratic State Convention on assembling to-day received the report of the Committee on Fusion. It recited that the People's party and Silver Republicans were in accord with the programme of fusion, and would support the Democratic fusion, and if it should proceed along the lines mapped out. It urged the adoption of the fusion plan, and the matter was put to a vote without debate. Congressman James C. Maguire was nominated for Governor by a rising vote.

"While we do not favor an aggressive policy of territorial expansion, we are opposed to the surrender to Spain of any

of the territory that has been acquired by American valor and the expenditure of the blood and treasure of our people."

WISCONSIN REPUBLICANS.

Nominations for Governor and Other State Officers.

MILWAUKEE, August 18.—Following is the Republican ticket as completed at to-day's session of the State convention:

For Governor, Edward Scofield, of Oconto; Lieutenant-Governor, Jesse Stone, of Watertown; Secretary of State, W. H. Foreblich, of Jackson; Treasurer, J. O. Davidson, of Soldier's Grove; Attorney-General, E. R. Hicks, of Oshkosh; Superintendent of Public Instruction, L. D. Harris, of Milwaukee; Railroad Commissioner, Emil Giljohann, of Milwaukee. The convention came to a close this evening, after two days' hard work.

FEVER AT KEY WEST.

"Yellow-Jack" Has Shown Himself in the Barracks.

KEY WEST, FLA., August 18.—T. P. M.—With the exception of the gunboat Princeton and the monitor Manatonah, the fleet has been ordered to Norfolk without delay, and many vessels have already departed.

The naval base has been transferred from Key West to Norfolk.

YELLOW-FEVER AT KEY WEST.

The reason for this is the appearance of yellow-fever here. There are now ten cases in the marine barracks, all the victims being marines. Forty persons in all are in the building, which is an old cigar factory, and a most rigid quarantine is being maintained.

At this writing only one of the cases is said to be serious. Whether there are any scattered cases throughout the town is not known, but this will be determined by a house-to-house inspection.

WILL BE CONFINED TO BARRACKS.

The Marine Hospital and local physicians are confident that the disease will be confined to the barracks, and that there is no danger of an epidemic. The utmost precautions are being observed, however, and State-Health-Officer Porter, who arrived on the steamer to leave the island, refused to return to Tampa. He will not return to Tampa, he will not return to Tampa, he will not return to Tampa.

Later in the evening the Mascotte, which carries an immune crew, was allowed to sail, but without any passengers.

SENT THE NEWSPAPER BOYS BACK

General Blanco Will Not Allow Them to Enter Havana Yet.

HABANA, August 18.—Yesterday there arrived from Key West correspondents of the New York Evening Post, the Journal and Advertiser, the Chicago Record, and another newspaper correspondent, none of whom were permitted by General Blanco to land. The Governor-General considers their arrival here inopportune, and believes that their presence here before the arrival of the American Peace Commission might cause difficulties. The correspondents returned last night to Key West on board the schooner Adams.

One hundred Americans, who landed at Maria Gorda on the 14th instant, after a conference with the leaders, Gayo and Lazo, re-embarked. They afterwards sent a supply of hardtack sufficient for eight days to Varona. A majority of the rebels in that province are nearly naked and entirely without shoes. They requested the Americans to provide them with clothes, etc.

CABLE CENSORSHIP CEASES.

Both Our Country and Spain Now Remove Restrictions.

NEW YORK, August 18.—The Western Union Telegraph Company's central cable office announces that censorship on cable messages has been abolished. The Commercial Cable Company makes the following announcement: "We are advised on all commercial code and cypher messages to and from Cuba, Porto Rico, and all the West Indian islands."

General Greely sent notification to the telegraph companies as follows:

"Censorship is raised on all commercial code, or cypher dispatches to and from Cuba, Porto Rico, and all West Indian islands."

"In addition, arrangements have been made with the Spanish Government authorities whereby they agree to abolish similar restrictions on code messages to and from the Spanish islands, and over private telegrams containing statements injurious to the interests of Spain. Similar action will be taken regarding like messages in the future. The censorship will be of the most liberal character."

(Signed) "A. W. GREELEY, Chief Signal Officer, United States Army."

THE SPANISH COMMISSIONERS.

General Blanco to Be One for Cuba—Castillo to Preside at Paris.

LONDON, August 18.—The Madrid correspondent of the Daily News says that Generals Blanco, Castellanos, and Leon, and Admiral Manterola, have been appointed commissioners for Cuba, and General Leon will be the Spanish representative at the Paris conference. It is probable, the correspondent says, that General Leon will be the Spanish representative at the Paris conference. It is probable, the correspondent says, that General Leon will be the Spanish representative at the Paris conference.

PROFESSOR DEAD.

A Well-Known Pugilist Breathes His Last in New Orleans.

NEW ORLEANS, August 18.—Prof. John H. Duffy, the referee of the Sullivan-Corbett, Fitzsimmons-Maher, and many other fierce battles fought in New Orleans, died to-day. He was a clever lightweight, and won several battles until weak lungs forced him to abandon boxing, after which he was referee for the Olympia club and other organizations. He had been ailing for some time. He was thirty-four years of age.

A LITTLE BOY KILLED.

A Negro Lad Struck Him—Great Indignation Over the Matter.

PRINCETON, KY., August 18.—Jimmie Johnson (white), 12 years old, and Charles Wood (a negro), aged 14, while engaged in a game of marbles this afternoon, began disputing, and the negro struck Johnson in the back and killed him. Wood was lodged in jail. There is great excitement over the matter, owing to the prominence of the Johnson family. It is thought by many that a mob will hang the negro to-night.

VEVUSIUS IN ACTIVE ERUPTION.

Four Streams of Lava Flowing Down the Mountain.

NAPLES, August 18.—Vesuvius is again in a state of active eruption. Four streams of lava are flowing down the mountain side, at the rate of 400 yards an hour. The chestnut trees on Mount Semma have been burned. Constant explosions are heard in the central crater, which is emitting smoke and flames.

THE ARGUMENT OVER

In the Case of the Third Virginia Regiment.

GOBIN APPEARS FOR BUTLER,

And Makes a Rather Extravagant Plea of Militarism.

THE REPLY OF MR. MONTAGUE.

Running a Red-Hot Iron Through the Body of Patriotism—The Major-General's Action Without a Precedent.

CAMP ALGER, VA., August 18.—(Special.)—The play is over and the curtain has been run down at last upon General Butler's version of "Much Ado About Nothing." The court of inquiry sat at Camp Alger listening to the arguments of able counsel on both sides until shortly after 3 o'clock to-day, when the case having been closed, the court was cleared and the work of framing a report was begun. Members of the tribunal believe that a report will be completed in a single session to-morrow. The verdict will be carefully guarded, and will be taken to General Graham at corps headquarters by Lieutenant Sumner, the recorder of the court. An interesting development in the proceedings to-day was the appearance of Brigadier-General P. S. Gobin upon the scene as counsel for General Butler. This officer is a distinguished lawyer and prominent politician of the State of Pennsylvania, and his argument in extenuation of General Butler's celebrated order was a polished piece of rhetoric, although its force was minimized by the fact that the brigadier had heard nothing of the evidence, knew little, apparently, of the merits of the case, and was forced into a rather extravagant plea for militarism by Attorney-General Montague, and though he had the privilege of rejoinder he made no reply.

IN BAD TASTE.

The appearance of General Gobin at this late day was a genuine surprise, and in the light of recent events it was decidedly unfortunate, for, as General Butler relinquishes the command of the division, the fact that he is to be succeeded by the brigadier, it lays him open to the imputation of bad taste.

Mr. Hamilton was still unable to be present when the court convened this morning, but other counsel for the regiment announced that he appeared at General Butler's request. After some amendments had been made in the record of the proceedings there was a spirited argument as to the mode of procedure. Mr. Moore, counsel for the regiment, suggested that the prosecution should open and close.

General Butler protested, with some show of indignation, against being put in the light of a prosecution. Colonel Nalle, he said, had asked for the inquiry, and no one would be pleased than he (the speaker) if the regiment were exonerated.

MR. MOORE'S SPEECH.

The Court decided that counsel for Colonel Nalle should open the argument, with the understanding that neither side would be prevented from replying to the other as long as there was anything to be said. The court then turned to the subject of the order of the day, which the attention of the court must be directed.

That order sentence whether the punishment should be inflicted on the regiment, and that which it proposed to inflict could be imposed, as the statutes were against the dishonorable discharge of a man without the sentence of a court-martial. That threat was an evidence, he argued, of the extreme measures adopted against the regiment. That General Butler witnessed riotous conduct on the part of a few members of the regiment was not sufficient reason for the punishment, but the order questionable from a legal standpoint, but there was absolutely no precedent for it. The speaker passed the question in review, and argued from it that no officer should be discharged from duty if no man failed to obey his officers.

BUTLER'S TESTIMONY.

He then took General Butler's testimony as the ground of specifications which he submitted to the Court as follows: 1. When General Butler arrived at the Virginia camp he saw seventy-five or one hundred men around the Young Men's Christian Association tent, shouting and acting in a disorderly manner. He announced that he was ordered to disperse them, but they refused to obey. He then ordered the men to be dispersed, and they were dispersed.

2. The manner of the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

3. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

4. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

5. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

6. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

7. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

8. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

9. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

10. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

11. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

12. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

13. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

14. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

15. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

16. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

17. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

18. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

19. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

20. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

21. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

22. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

23. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

24. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

25. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

26. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

27. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

28. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

29. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

30. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

31. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

32. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

33. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

34. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

35. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

36. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

37. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

38. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

39. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

40. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

41. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

42. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

43. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

44. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

45. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

46. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

47. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

48. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

49. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

50. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

51. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

52. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

53. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

54. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

55. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

56. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

57. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

58. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

59. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

60. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

61. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

62. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

63. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

64. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

65. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

66. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

67. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

68. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

69. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense.

70. The punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and not to the individuals who were guilty of the offense. He then argued that the punishment was meted out to the regiment as a whole, and